



REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
GROUP 2834  
PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q63433

Masaharu TOMIYAMA, et al.

Appln. No.: 09/816,348

Group Art Unit: 2834

Confirmation No.: 6359

Examiner: Dang D. LE

Filed: March 26, 2001

For: MOTOR FOR DRIVING BLOWER FAN

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

ATTN: BOX AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated August 21, 2002, please consider the remarks as submitted herewith.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4 and 6-11 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-4 and 6-11 presently stand rejected.

Claims 1-4 and 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by newly cited Moribayashi et al. (5,576,588).

**Analysis**

Claims 1 and 11 are the only claims in independent form; therefore, the following discussion is initially directed to these independent claims.

AF  
2834

RECEIVED  
NOV 22 2002  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Request for Reconsideration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/816,348

Claim 1 is directed to a motor for driving a blower fan. It includes a cylindrical case body, a rear end plate fixed to a rear end of the case body and a front end plate on the front end of the case body. It also includes a rotary drive shaft, a rotor and a stator. A reinforcing portion is provided in the vicinity of an end portion of the stator. This reinforcing portion includes a ring portion and a cylinder portion which extends from an outer peripheral edge of the ring portion.

With the reinforcing portion of the present invention, the blower fan motor is secured without causing the undesirable noise and vibrational problems of the prior art.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1 for the following reasons.

Moribayashi is directed to a magnet type rotating machine. In some of the embodiments, it includes a holder plate 45 (see Figs. 28-32) which is anchored to the yoke 41 in various ways.

The reinforcing portion of the present invention "includes a ring portion and a cylinder portion extending from an outer peripheral edge of the ring portion." See claim 1. Moribayashi fails to disclose this structure.

Specifically, Moribayashi merely discloses a holder plate 45 having press-fitting holes 45c and punched out portions 41c on one side, and bent spring portions 45a and spacers 45b on the other side. See Figs. 28-29 of Moribayashi. The Examiner asserts that the punched out portions 41c are cylinder portions (see page 3 of Office action); however, these elements do not satisfy the structure of a cylinder. The punched out portions 41c (see Fig. 29) are merely part of the yoke 41 which fit with the press-fitting holes 45c of the holder plate 45. See col. 6, lines 45-

Request for Reconsideration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
U.S. Appl. No. 09/816,348

47. Moreover, these holes 45c of the plate 45 are formed in tab-like portions (see Figs. 28 and 32) rather than a continuous cylindrical structure.

In view of the foregoing, the present invention according to claim 1 is distinguishable from Moribayashi.

Moribayashi also fails to anticipate the invention according to claim 11, because Moribayashi does not disclose U-shaped bent portions formed by end portions of the case body. Rather, the so-called reinforcing portion 19 is actually a punched out portion of the yoke 16 but is not a bent portion and is not formed in a U-shape.

In addition, the magnet 18 is not fixed to a base portion of a U-shape. Instead, the magnet 18 is merely pressed against a side of the punched out portion 19.

In view of the foregoing, claim 11 is distinguishable from Moribayashi.

The remaining rejections are directed to the dependent claims. These claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 above, by virtue of their dependency therefrom. Moreover, these claims are patentable due to their own limitations contained therein.

For example, claim 7 recites that the outer circumferential surface of the cylinder portion has a conic surface inclined so that the diameter increases as it moves away from the ring portion. The Examiner asserts that Moribayashi discloses this feature, although no comment is provided as to where this feature is shown in Moribayashi.

As mentioned above, Moribayashi does not disclose a cylinder portion. The asserted cylinder portion 41c is merely a punched out portion of the case body 41. There is no cylinder structure. Moreover, there is no inclined conic surface for the punched out portion 41c. In

Request for Reconsideration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/816,348

contrast, the present invention provides a ring portion 23 with a cylinder portion 24 that is inclined outward (see Fig. 2). Since this feature is not disclosed in Moribayashi, claim 7 is patentable for these additional reasons.

### Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ellen R. Smith  
Registration No. 43,042

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Date: November 21, 2002

Attorney Docket No.: Q63433